REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were originally presented for examination. The Office Action dated April 2, 2008 rejects claims 1-22.

This paper amends claims 1, 3, 5, and 6, adds claims 23-30, and cancels claims 7-22. Support for the amendment can be found at least in paragraphs [0029] and [0031] of the applicant's specification. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 3, and 5-22 prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 were amended and claims 7-22 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims as presented prior to this Amendment, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 3, and 5-22, and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claims 1-6 and 23-30 are now pending in the application.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 10 are objected to because claim 7 recites "documents", then later recites "the document", and claim 10 recites the acronym "XML" without spelling out its first usage. In view of the cancellation of claims 7 and 10, applicant submits that these objections are moot.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5-10, 14, 18 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 5 and 6 to remove any indefiniteness. The applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 of claims 7-10, 14, 18, and 22 is moot in view of their cancellation.

35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 7-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In view of their cancellation, applicant submits that the rejection of claims 7-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is moot.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Baber et al in US Patent No. 7,171,691 (hereinafter Baber). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the extent it is maintained against the claims as amended.

The applicant's invention, as now set forth in independent claim 1, recites a method for protecting a computing device from potentially harmful code in a document. One or more definitions of potentially harmful active content are provided in an editable text file. Each definition identifies potentially harmful active content and *specifies an action* to be performed on that potentially harmful active content if that potentially harmful active content is found in the document. The document is compared with each definition of potentially harmful active content in the editable text file to identify potentially harmful active content within the document. The document is modified to render harmless any identified potentially harmful active content before presenting the document to the computing device.

Baber teaches a content sanitizing transcoding engine. The transcoding engine includes patterns. Each pattern identifies malicious content. These patterns are used to find matching patterns in a well-formed document. Any matched patterns in the document are considered to have potentially malicious content. Node elements of the document that contain the potentially malicious content are annotated with an annotation and subsequently sanitized.

The office action equates Baber's patterns to the applicant's claimed definitions of potentially harmful active content. Unlike the applicant's definition of potentially harmful active content, however, Baber's pattern does not specify an action to be performed on the malicious content if such content is found in the document. Rather, Baber's pattern serves only to identify a location in the document for inserting an annotation (i.e., at a matching node). For instance, Baber's pattern does not specify whether the matching pattern in the document is to be removed or whether the matching pattern can stay in the document. In Baber, this determination is left to the sanitization process, which occurs after the annotation process. During the sanitization process, sanitization rules specific to the annotated elements determine the action to be performed on the malicious content, "whether to remove the annotated element, or whether the annotated element such as a form can remain in the transcoded document" (col. 5, ll. 61-65). Hence, in Baber, sanitization rules, not patterns, determine the action to be performed on malicious content. Thus, Baber cannot be seen to suggest using a definition of potentially harmful active content to specify the action to be performed on that active content, as now set forth in the applicant's claimed invention.

For a reference to anticipate the applicant's invention, that reference must show each element and limitation of the applicant's claims. As noted above, Baber does not teach or suggest "each definition of potentially harmful active content ... specifying an action to be performed on that potentially harmful active content if that potentially harmful active content is found in the document", as now set forth in the applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to the claim overcomes the rejection and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Each dependent claim 2-6 depends directly or indirectly from patentable

independent claim 1, and incorporates all of its limitations and, therefore, is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least this reason. Moreover, each dependent claim also recites an additional limitation, which, in combination with the elements and limitations of its independent claim, may further distinguish that dependent claim from the cited reference. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

New claims 23-30

Claims 23-30 are dependent claims, which depend from patentable independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable as written for at least this reason. Moreover, each dependent claim also recites an additional limitation, which, in combination with the elements and limitations of its independent claim, may further distinguish that dependent claim from the cited reference.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that this paper provides a response for all pending claims. Any absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, or to any taking of "official notice" or reliance on "common sense", however, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, comment, taking of "official notice", or reliance on "common sense". In addition, because the arguments made above are not exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed.

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the applicant's representative would expedite allowance of this application, the

Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-0932.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 2, 2008
Reg. No. 41,274

/Michael A. Rodriguez/
Michael A. Rodriguez
Attorney for Applicant
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752

Tel. No.: (508) 303-0932
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005